

# Governor's Water Augmentation Council

## Long-Term Water Augmentation Committee

### September 19, 2017 Meeting Summary

**Time: 10:00am – 12:00pm**

**Location: Arizona Department of Water Resources**

#### Welcome and Opening Remarks

Chairwoman Maureen George called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance. The following members of the Governor's Water Augmentation Council (GWAC) were present: Wade Noble, Chris Udall, Warren Tenney, and Virginia O'Connell.

#### Discussion Regarding WRDC Demand and Supply Numbers through 2060 Revised for Use by GWAC Committees

Gerry Walker, Deputy Assistant Director of the ADWR, gave a short presentation on the progress achieved thus far on the update to the statewide projections of water supply-and-demand data from the Water Resources Development Commission (WRDC). For the purposes of the GWAC committees, ADWR has been asked by the committee chairs to project water supply-and-demand data in ten-year increments for the years 2020, 2030, 2040, 2050, and 2060. Ms. Walker informed the committee that the water demand total from each of the 22 Planning Areas of the state are expected to be lower than initially projected for the year 2060. Ms. Walker's slides can be viewed [here](#).

#### Discussion Regarding Protocol for Committee Chairs to Make Recommendations

Chairwoman George informed the committee that in order to move forward with hiring a consultant to conduct an evaluation of the 22 Planning Areas for various water augmentation projects, she and ADWR staff would draft a letter or a resolution to the GWAC Chairman, who would then place the proposed study as an item of discussion on the agenda for the next GWAC meeting. The GWAC would then approve or deny the committee's proposal. If the GWAC approves, a consultant with the necessary qualifications and specialists on staff to conduct the work will be selected by the Long-Term Water Augmentation Committee in a separate meeting.

#### Discussion Regarding Contractors to Receive Scope of Work

A discussion was held during the meeting to review the process by which a vendor would be selected to perform the work of the research study, which is described within the [Scope of Work](#).

#### Review Vendor Process

Ms. Walker reviewed the vendor selection process which involves an evaluation of the qualifications of pre-approved vendors who have been awarded contracts in the past by the State Procurement Office. These vendors, who are determined to be the most qualified for the purposes of the project, are sent a scope of work by ADWR staff and are given a short timeframe to reply. The work can also be shared between multiple vendors who have received the scope of work.

## Review Evaluation Process

Zack Richards, Water Resource Specialist with ADWR, reviewed an evaluation chart of vendors with whom ADWR has entered into contracts in the past and which have delivered satisfactory work. These vendors were rated based on the qualifications they submit on an annual basis to the State Procurement Office, titled the Annual Statement of Qualifications, which can be found [here](#). The services that they provide that are applicable and necessary to the project are noted on the chart.

## Solicit Input on Contractors

Committee members are welcome to add any vendors to this list that they feel should be included. Scott Deeny of The Nature Conservancy encouraged additional services from the vendor relating to environmental impacts. Bill Plummer recommended identifying the top five key services provided by the consultants that are the most applicable to the scope of work. Chairwoman George noted that the committee may need to convene immediately after the next GWAC meeting to determine the consultants who would receive the scope of work.

## Proposed Projects

### Approval of the Scope of Work

The scope of work was edited by the committee so that it was not portrayed as a feasibility study, but rather as a research study that would inform the Planning Areas of available water augmentation options within their geographic region based on a variety of factors.

Each of the evaluation factors was defined by ADWR staff so that the consultant(s) had a relatively clear understanding of the depth of the research that is expected from them.

Task 2 for the consultant was given additional flexibility in regard to the page length of the document to be submitted to the committee.

Chairwoman George advised against giving the consultant the task of prioritizing the water augmentation option on behalf of the Planning Areas, but rather allowing the Planning Areas to decide for themselves which of the options would be a priority given the information provided by the consultant.

### Discussion Regarding Funding

For funding purposes, ADWR would apply for a grant from the Bureau of Reclamation that would assist in the cost-share of the research study.

## Discussion and Action Regarding Recommendations to Director

### Scope of Work

The committee will draft a recommendation letter to the Chairman of the GWAC and the Director of ADWR proposing the scope of work and intentions of the research study.

### Funding

The committee would propose to utilize funds from ADWR's Rural Water Studies Special Line Item to assist in the cost-share of the research study.

### Post-Project Local Hearings

Chairwoman George noted that after the final deliverable from the consultant was delivered to the committee, ADWR would receive local input through the Planning Area process regarding the results of the study and the recommendations therein. The consultant may or may not be involved in this process.

### Determine and Assign Committee Tasks

Committee members are encouraged to reach out to Zack Richards of ADWR with any additional vendors that they feel should be added to the evaluation chart of pre-approved vendors.

ADWR staff was tasked with discovering whether a vendor on the Annual Statements of Qualifications could subcontract out services to other vendors that are not pre-approved by the State Procurement Office.

### Public Comments

No public comments were given.

### Items for the Next Agenda

Committee members are encouraged to be prepared to discuss the completed evaluation chart at the following committee meeting.

### Closing Remarks and Next Meeting Date

The date and location for the next Long-Term Augmentation Committee meeting will be determined.